

Attorney docket TAIW 155

REMARKS

Claims 9-18 have been added. No new matter has been added. The claims are supported in the specification. In response to the outstanding office action:

[1] The Examiner's remarks are noted. Traversal is respectfully maintained.

[2-3] The specification has been revised to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection according to the recommendation of the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

[4-5] Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kichury (U.S. Patent 6,057,850) in view of Teo (U.S. Patent 6,385,349). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

The Examiner states that "Kichury discloses a step of extracting overlapped polygons from the image with the texture mapping within the spatial coordinate system (col. 6: 13-26)" (Action, pg. 4). However, a careful reading of Kichury will reveal that there is no mention, disclosure, or teaching of a step of comparing the image with the texture mapping within the spatial coordinate system to extract overlapped polygons. Claim 1 recites that polygons are located in the same coordinate (overlapped) in a common spatial coordinate system. Kichury, however, only discloses that overlapping drawn objects and their characteristics are to have the same depth values (col. 6: 13-26). The overlapped polygons are not equivalent to the overlapping drawn objects. As a result, a step of "using the pixel intensity of the overlapped polygons to compute a statistics mean for adjusting the pixel intensity of the image accordingly" is not in Kichury.

Regarding newly added claim 9, the Applicant notes that Kichury and Teo are completely silent as to: the overlapped polygons; a computing step by applying pixel intensity of the overlapped polygons; and a specific formula for the computing step.

AMENDMENT

8

10/626,698

Attorney docket TAIW 155

For the reasons stated above, it is Applicant's belief that Kichury and Teo do not teach or suggest all the limitations of instant claims 1 or 9 of the present application. It is therefore Applicant's belief that instant claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the cited reference. Insofar as all claims depend from instant claims 1 and 9, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of claims 1-18.

Respectfully submitted,

May 18, 2006
Date

Nick Bromer
Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
(717) 426-1664
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on May 18, 2006.

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]

Signature Nick Bromer

AMENDMENT

9

10/626,698